

### **REMARKS**

Applicants appreciate the Examiner's thorough consideration provided the present application. Claims 1-29 are now present in the application. Claims 1, 4-11 and 13-20 have been amended. Claims 21-29 have been added. Claims 1 and 13 are independent. Reconsideration of this application, as amended, is respectfully requested.

### **Priority Under 35 U.S.C. §119**

Applicants thank the Examiner for acknowledging Applicants' claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. §119, and receipt of the certified priority document.

### **Information Disclosure Citation**

Applicants thank the Examiner for considering the references supplied with the Information Disclosure Statement filed on December 29, 2004 and August 11, 2005, and for providing Applicants with an initialed copy of the PTO-1449 form filed therewith.

### **Drawings**

The Examiner did not indicate whether or not the formal drawings have been accepted. Since no objection has been received, Applicants assume that the drawings are acceptable and that no further action is necessary. Confirmation thereof in the next Office Action is respectfully requested.

### **Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103**

Claims 1-20 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Guiles, U.S. Patent No. 5,538,471, in view of Lohr, U.S. Patent No. 6,878,177, and further in view of Jung, Korean Patent Application Publication No. 1020030016787. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

A complete discussion of the Examiner's rejection is set forth in the Office Action, and is not being repeated here.

In light of the foregoing amendments to claims 1 and 13, Applicants respectfully submit that this rejection has been obviated and/or rendered moot. While not conceding to the Examiner's rejection, but merely to expedite prosecution, as the Examiner will note, independent claims 1 and 13 have been amended.

Independent claim 1 recites a combination of elements including "a cabinet including an inlet through which a room air of a room is drawn, and an outlet from which a cleaned air is discharged to the room", "a filter assembly to remove dust and smell particles from the room air drawn through the inlet", "a fan located inside the cabinet so as to discharge the room air filtered by the filter assembly to the outlet after drawing the room air", "a sensor assembly located inside the cabinet so as to sense composition of the room air drawn through the inlet", "a supplier assembly located inside the cabinet so as to provide at least one of components of the room air to the room air filtered by the filter assembly" and "a controller for controlling the supplier assembly to supply the at least one of the components of the room air to the room air filtered by the filter assembly when the sensor assembly senses an insufficient amount of the at least one of the components of the room air drawn through the inlet".

Independent claim 13 recites a combination of elements including “sensing a room air drawn from a room into the inside of a cabinet through an inlet”, “measuring at least one of components of the room air and comparing a sensed amount of the at least one of the components from the sensing step with previously inputted data”, “supplying the at least one of the components of the room air to the room air filtered by a filter assembly when the sensed amount is less than the previously inputted data”, and “guiding the room air filtered by a filter assembly and the supplied at least one of the components of the room air to an outlet by a fan”.

Support for the above combinations of elements and steps can be found in FIGs. 3-7 and the corresponding description in the specification as originally filed. Applicants respectfully submit that the combinations of elements and steps as set forth in amended independent claims 1 and 13 are not disclosed or suggested by the references relied on by the Examiner.

Guiles discloses a dynamic particulate control system 12 to control particulate levels in an isolated room 14 (see FIG. 1). Although the Examiner referred to the dynamic particulate control system 12 as the cabinet of claim 1, Applicants respectfully disagree. In fact, Guiles nowhere discloses that the dynamic particulate control system 12 is a cabinet or any similar structure. The dotted box 12 in FIG. 1 of Guiles is simply used to illustrate the dynamic particulate control system 12. Since the dotted box 12 is not a cabinet of claim 1, Guiles fails to teach “a fan located inside the cabinet”, “a sensor assembly located inside the cabinet”, “a supplier assembly located inside the cabinet” as recited in claim 1.

In addition, as shown in FIG. 1 of Guiles, the dynamic particulate control system 12 is outside the isolated room 14. Although the Examiner referred to the sensor 92 as the sensor assembly of claim 1, the sensor 92 is in the isolated room 14. Therefore, the sensor 92 is not in

the dynamic particulate control system 12 (referred to by the Examiner as the cabinet). Accordingly, Guiles also fails to teach “a sensor assembly located inside the cabinet” as recited in claim 1, not to mention the fact that the dynamic particulate control system 12 is not a cabinet.

Furthermore, although the dynamic particulate control system 12 has an inlet to draw the air, the air is not from the isolated room but outside the isolated room 14. Therefore, Guiles fails to teach “a cabinet including an inlet through which a room air of a room is drawn”, “a filter assembly to remove dust and smell particles from the room air drawn through the inlet”, “a fan... to discharge the room air filtered by the filter assembly to the outlet after drawing the room air” as recited in claim 1, and “sensing a room air drawn from a room into the inside of a cabinet through an inlet” as recited in claim 13.

The Examiner also failed to establish the *prima facie* case of obviousness. In particular, the Examiner failed to indicate where the utilized references teach “a supplier assembly located inside the cabinet so as to provide at least one of components of the room air to the room air filtered by the filter assembly” and “a controller for controlling the supplier assembly to supply the at least one of the components of the room air to the room air filtered by the filter assembly when the sensor assembly senses an insufficient amount of the at least one of the components of the room air drawn through the inlet” as recited in amended claim 1 and “supplying the at least one of the components of the room air to the room air filtered by a filter assembly when the sensed amount is less than the previously inputted data”, and “guiding the room air filtered by a filter assembly and the supplied at least one of the components of the room air to an outlet by a fan” as recited in amended claim 13.

Although Guiles discloses a controller 68, Guiles nowhere discloses that the controller 68 controls any supplier assembly to supply the at least one of the components when the sensor assembly senses an insufficient amount of the at least one of the components of the room air drawn through the inlet as recited in claims 1 and 13.

Jung discloses a controller 500 and a variety of sensors in FIG. 3. However, Jung merely discloses that the controller has an air conditioner 500/1, a circulator 500/2, and a heater 500/n. Jung nowhere teaches that the controller 500 can control any supplier assembly to supply the at least one of the components when the sensor assembly senses an insufficient amount of the at least one of the components of the room air drawn through the inlet as recited in claims 1 and 13.

Lohr also fails to teach any controller and therefore cannot cure the deficiencies of Guiles.

Accordingly, none of the utilized references individually or in combination teach or suggest the limitations of amended independent claims 1 and 13. Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit that amended independent claims 1 and 13 clearly define over the teachings of the utilized references.

In addition, claims 2-12 and 14-20 depend, either directly or indirectly, from independent claims 1 and 13, and are therefore allowable based on their respective dependence from independent claims 1 and 13, which are believed to be allowable.

In view of the above remarks, Applicants respectfully submit that claims 1-20 clearly define the present invention over the references relied on by the Examiner. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103 are respectfully requested.

### **Additional Claims**

Additional claims 21-29 have been added for the Examiner's consideration.

Applicants respectfully submit that claims 21-29 are allowable due to their respective dependence on independent claims 1 and 13, as well as due to the additional recitations included in these claims.

Favorable consideration and allowance of additional claims 21-29 are respectfully requested.

### **Additional Cited References**

Since the remaining patents cited by the Examiner have not been utilized to reject the claims, but rather to merely show the state of the art, no further comments are necessary with respect thereto.

### **CONCLUSION**

All the stated grounds of rejection have been properly traversed and/or rendered moot. Applicants therefore respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider all presently pending rejections and that they be withdrawn.

It is believed that a full and complete response has been made to the Office Action, and that as such, the Examiner is respectfully requested to send the application to Issue.

In the event there are any matters remaining in this application, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at (703) 205-8000 in the Washington, D.C. area.

If necessary, the Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future replies, to charge payment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 02-2448 for any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. §§1.16 or 1.17; particularly, extension of time fees.

Dated: January 13, 2006

Respectfully submitted,

By: 

James T. Eller, Jr.

Registration No.: 39,538

BIRCH, STEWART, KOLASCH & BIRCH, LLP

8110 Gatehouse Road

Suite 100 East

P.O. Box 747

Falls Church, Virginia 22040-0747

(703) 205-8000

Attorney for Applicant